



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,700	04/15/2004	Yongcheng Li	RSW920040021US1 (BMR-0072	6793
45541 7590 07/02/2008 HOFFMAN WARNICK LLC 75 STATE ST 14TH FLOOR ALBANY, NY 12207				
EXAMINER VO, HUYEN X				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2626				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/02/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/824,700

Applicant(s)

LI ET AL.

Examiner

HUYEN X. VO

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 and 19-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 and 19-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 4/15/2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Claim 18 is missing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

4. Claims 21-26 are drawn to a "program" *per se* as recited in the preamble (*since the term "recordable storage medium" is not clearly defined in the disclosure, it is reasonable to interpret the term as a piece of paper having program codes written on it. Therefore, claims 21-26 are considered computer-program claims*) and as such is non-statutory subject matter. See MPEP § 2106.IV.B.1.a. Data structures not claimed as embodied in computer readable media are descriptive material *per se* and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer. See, e.g., *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure *per se* held

nonstatutory). Such claimed data structures do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and other claimed aspects of the invention, which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer readable medium encoded with a data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. Similarly, computer programs claimed as computer listings *per se*, i.e., the descriptions or expressions of the programs are not physical "things." They are neither computer components nor statutory processes, as they are not "acts" being performed. Such claimed computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements of a computer, which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-9, 11-12, 14-16, 19-23, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richardson et al. (US 7295963) in view of Brandon et al. (US 6385568).

7. Regarding claims 1, 8, 14, and 21, Richardson et al. disclose an autonomic translation method, computer-implemented business method, system, and computer program product, comprising:

receiving content to be translated (*source document 302 in figure 3 or referring to col. 6, lines 47-56*);

translating the content from a first language into a single translation in a second language using a translation resource (*automatic translation 330 and automatically generated translation 304 in figure 3 or referring to col. 6, lines 47-56*);

providing translation process details corresponding to the translation to a user (*step 402 in figure 4; providing translation with confidence metrics*); and

receiving feedback pertaining to the translation based on the translation process details from the user (*steps 404-408 in figure 4*).

Richardson et al. fail to specifically disclose that the translation process details specifying, for a particular word in the content, a context of the translation that is based on words in the content surrounding the particular word in which the translating occurred. However, Brandon et al. teach that the translation process details specifying, for a particular word in the content, a context that is based on words in the content surrounding the particular word in which the translating occurred (*col. 3, lines 25-51, "meaning code" is provided for end user to correct the translation; and or referring to col. 1, lines 33-46; the meaning of a word is determined based on surrounding words*).

Since Richardson et al. and Brandon et al. are analogous in the art because they are from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art at the time of invention to modify Richardson et al. by incorporating the teaching of Brandon et al. in order to improve translation accuracy by specifying the context or meaning of the word to the translator.

8. Regarding claims 2, 4-7, 15, and 22, Richardson et al. further disclose updating the translation resource based on the feedback (*referring to the operation of figure 4; updating is done based on translation and confidence metrics*), wherein the method is computer-implemented (*col. 3, lines 4-20*), wherein the content is received on a server over the network from a user operating a client (*col. 8, lines 15-53*), wherein the feedback is received from a user requesting the translation (*figure 4; the user correct translation*), wherein the providing step comprises displaying the content in the first language and in the second language in an interface page (*monitor 191 in figure 1; also referring to col. 8, lines 40-53*).

9. Regarding claim 3, Richardson et al. fail to specifically disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the translation process details specify a context in which the content was translated from the first language to the second language. Branson et al. teach that the translation process details specify a context in which the content was translated from the first language to the second language (*col. 3, lines 25-51, "meaning code" is provided for end user to correct the translation; and or referring to col. 1, lines 33-46; the meaning of a word is determined based on surrounding words*).

Since Richardson et al. and Brandon et al. are analogous in the art because they are from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Richardson et al. by incorporating the teaching of Brandon et al. in order to improve translation accuracy by specifying the context or meaning of the word to the translator.

10. Regarding claims 9, 16, and 23, Richardson et al. further disclose providing an interface page to the user (*figure 5B, client computing device 522 includes monitor and input mechanisms for the user to enter source text*), wherein the confidence metric of the translation is displayed in the interface page (*client computer device 522 in figure 5B and also referring to monitor 191 in figure 1; or step 402 in figure 4; the context of the translation is taught in Brandon reference in claims 1 and 8*), and wherein the interface page includes a mechanism for the user to provide the feedback (*figure 5B, client computing device 522 and the operation of figure 4*).

11. Regarding claims 11-12, 19-20, and 25-26, Richardson et al. further disclose wherein the method is implemented over a network (*figure 5B*), wherein the user operates a client and communicates the content to a server in the first language for translation into the second language (*figure 5B; server translation*).

12. Claims 10, 13, 17, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richardson et al. (US 7295963) in view of Brandon et al. (US 6385568), and further in view of official notice.

13. Regarding claims 10, 13, 17, and 24, Richardson et al. fail to specifically disclose wherein the translation resource comprises a field dictionary, and the translating is performed on a subscription basis. However, examiner takes office official notice that domain-specific or field-specific dictionary and providing translation service to subscribed users are well-known in the translation art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to readily realize that using domain- or field-specific dictionary would produce a more accurate translation and that the translation service is provided for subscribed users.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUYEN X. VO whose telephone number is (571)272-7631. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on 571-272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2626

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Huyen X Vo/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2626

6/27/2008
